

Serial No. : 10/709,669
Applicant : Gerald A. Brouwer
Page : 5

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's review of the specification, claims, and drawings. In light of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application. The amendments and remarks presented herein are fully supported by the application as originally filed. No new matter has been entered.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2-14 are pending in the application. Claims 2-5 have been amended and claims 8-14 have been added. Claim 1 has been cancelled.

II. CLAIMS OBJECTED TO

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5-7 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but noted that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. Accordingly, Applicant has rewritten claim 5 in independent format to include all of the limitations of claim 1, from which claim 5 depended. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that claim 5 is now in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 6 and 7, both of which depend from claim 5, should now also be in condition for allowance as they depend from a now allowable claim.

III. CLAIMS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gilmore et al. '862.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 1 has been cancelled, thereby obviating the rejection with respect to this claim. Claims 2-4 have been amended to depend from now independent claim 5. Applicant submits, as discussed above, that claim 5 is presently in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant submits, claims 2-4 should now also be in condition for allowance as they depend from now allowable claim 5.

IV. NEW CLAIMS

Claims 8-14 have been added and are now pending in the application.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 5 and further specify that the spring assembly may comprise a torsion spring, an expansion spring, or a compression spring, as disclosed in

Serial No. : 10/709,669
Applicant : Gerald A. Brouwer
Page : 6

paragraph 13 of the specification. Applicant submits, as discussed above, that claim 5 is now in condition for allowance and, therefore, claims 8-10 should also be allowable as they depend from claim 5.

Independent claim 11 is similar to independent and now allowable claim 5, with the exception that the energy-storing device of claim 11 comprises a weight system as opposed to a spring assembly as called for in claim 5.

The use of a weight system as an energy-storing device is disclosed in paragraph 13 of the specification. The Examiner has determined that the prior art does not disclose an extendable conveying system for loading product to or unloading product from a trailer that incorporates a spring assembly as an energy-storing device as disclosed in claim 5. Similarly, Applicant submits, the prior art of record does not disclose such an extendable conveying system incorporating a weight system as an energy-storing device. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits, independent claim 11 should also be allowable. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and incorporate the limitations of claims 2-4. As urged above, claim 11 should be allowable and likewise, therefore, claims 12-14 should also be allowable.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims.


Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (616) 988-4117.

Respectfully submitted,

GERALD A. BROUWER

By: Van Dyke, Gardner, Linn
& Burkhardt, LLP

Dated: December 2, 2004.


Karl T. Ondersma
Registration No. 55 894
2851 Charlevoix Drive, S.E., Suite 207
Post Office Box 888695
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695
(616) 975-5500

KTO:wen
RAP04 P-648A